

1

2

3

4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

5

6

JOHN ANDREW HASSEL,

Plaintiff,

v.

MONIQUE CROSSLEY,

Defendant.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case No. [18-cv-01839-DMR](#)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CASE
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR
FAILURE TO PROSECUTE**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 9, 16

On March 26, 2018, pro se Plaintiff John Andrew Hassel filed suit in this Court along with an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). [Docket Nos. 1, 2, 3, 8.] On May 8, 2018, the court granted the IFP application, screened the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), and found that the complaint failed to state a claim. [Docket No. 9]. The court then ordered Mr. Hassel to file a first amended complaint by May 22, 2018. *Id.*

On May 14, 2018, Mr. Hassel filed a request for a two-week extension in which to file a first amended complaint. [Docket No. 16]. On May 17, 2018, the court granted the request and gave him until June 5, 2018 to file a first amended complaint. *Id.*

No amended complaint has been filed. Accordingly, the court ORDERS Mr. Hassel to respond by **June 18, 2018** and explain why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Failure to respond by **June 18, 2018** may result in dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 8, 2018

